

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-12 are pending in the application, with claim 1 being the independent claim. Claim 10, and Figures 1 and 2 are amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objection to the Drawings

In the Action on page 2, section 1, Figure 1 is objected to as lacking the designation "Prior Art." Figure 1 is amended to include the designation "Prior Art."

In the Action on page 2, section 2, Figure 2 is objected to as lacking the reference number 31 mentioned in the description. Figure 2 is amended to include the reference number 31. The attached replacement sheet includes these amendments. Applicant respectfully requests that the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

In the Action on page 2, section 3, Claim 10 is objected to as being of improper dependent form for not further limiting Claim 1. Applicant respectfully traverses the objection.

Claim 1 recites, among other elements, "...the triggering circuit ***being adapted to actuate or deploy*** a safety device..." The safety device recited in claim 1 is **not** part of the claimed invention. In contrast, Claim 10, as amended, specifically claims the combination of the elements of Claim 1 with a safety device. Claim 10 as amended is therefore not in improper dependent form, and Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

In the Action on page 3, sections 5-9, claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,602,736 to Toya et al. (hereinafter Toya). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a safety arrangement for a motor vehicle, the safety arrangement comprising sensor means in the form of at least one sensor adapted to sense a parameter indicative of an accident situation, and a control system controlling a triggering circuit, the control system incorporating at least one processor connected to the sensor means and to the triggering circuit, the processor having an input pin for activating a non-maskable interrupt (NMI) routine, ***the triggering circuit being adapted to actuate or deploy a safety device in response to a predetermined command generated by the processor*** in response to a predetermined output from the sensor means, said command generated by the processor creating an input to the said input pin of the

processor to start said NMI routine, said NMI routine serving to determine whether there are hardware and/or software faults that may invalidate the command, and to interrupt actuation or deployment of the safety device if any such fault is detected.

Toya fails to teach at least one element of Claim 1, namely, Toya does not teach the triggering circuit being adapted to actuate or deploy a safety device **in response to a predetermined command generated by the processor**. The Action aligns this element with the first and second activation signals K1, K2 applied to the bases of the switching transistors of control circuits 8, 9 of Toya (col. 3, lines 53-55). This alignment is not correct. Instead, in Figure 1, Toya teaches a microprocessor 7 that performs two different main computational routines. The first routine 7A determines whether to send signals along the lines K1 and K2 to the trigger circuit 8 and 9 to activate the safety device on the basis of a signal D from the accelerometer 4. A second routine 7B checks the software for errors or faults. The first routine 7A is triggered on an interrupt basis at prescribed regular time intervals, and starts calculating whether to activate the safety device on the basis of a signal from accelerometer 4 at the beginning of each interval. A watchdog timer 16 is provided which is also triggered at the same time that the first routine 7A is triggered, and which resets the microprocessor 7 at 7E if the first routine 7A takes too long to complete its calculation in any one of the above-mentioned regular time intervals. Although the watchdog timer 16 contains a computational routine that *might* be similar to the NMI routine of Claim 1, the watchdog timer 16 is triggered on an interrupt basis at the same time as the first routine 7A, and **not** in response to a predetermined command generated by the processor, as recited in Claim 1.

Similarly, the second routine 7B of Toya is triggered when the microprocessor 7 is initially powered, and subsequently runs on a continuous loop. The second routine 7B is therefore **not** triggered in response to predetermined command generated by the processor.

The monitoring timer routine 7C is triggered whenever the routine 7B takes too long in its operation. Monitoring timer routine 7C is therefore **not** triggered in response to a predetermined command generated by the processor. None of the routines that control the activation signals K1, K2 are triggered in response to a predetermined command generated by the processor. Therefore Toya does not teach the triggering circuit being adapted to actuate or deploy a safety device in response to a predetermined command generated by the processor. Claim 1 is therefore allowable and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4, 8 and 10 depend from Claim 1 and are allowable for being dependent on an allowable claim.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Action on page 4, sections 11-12, claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toya in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,283,472 to Takeuchi et al (hereinafter Takeuchi). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As discussed above, Claim 1 is allowable, for at least the reason that Toya does not teach the triggering circuit being adapted to actuate or deploy a safety device in response to a predetermined command generated by the processor. Claim 3 is allowable as being dependent on

an allowable claim. Further, the teachings of Takeuchi fail to overcome the deficiencies of Toya. Thus, Claim 3 is non-obvious and allowable over Toya in view of Takeuchi.

Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

In the Action on page 4, section 13, claims 5-7, 9, 11 and 12 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. Because these claims are dependent from an allowable claim as discussed above, Applicant wishes to defer placing these claims in independent form at this time and respectfully requests that these claims be allowed.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Applicant: Francois GIORDANO
Appl. No. 10/089,785

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/6/04

Robert Kinberg
Registration No. 26,924
VENABLE
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998

Telephone: (202) 962-4800
Telefax: (202) 962-8300

\\ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS1\520597\1